and charging that it was misbranded. It was labeled in part: (Jars) "Supreme Brand Peanut Butter * * * Net Wt. 1 Pound."

The article was alleged to be misbranded in that the statement "Net Wt. 1 Pound" was false and misleading since it was not correct; and in that it was in package form and did not bear an accurate statement of the quantity of the contents

On December 20, 1940, no claimant having appeared, judgment of condemnation was entered and the product was ordered destroyed.

1351. Misbranding of peanut butter. U. S. v. 70 Cases of Peanut Butter. Default decree of condemnation. institutions. (F. D. C. No. 1878. Sample No. 10192-E.)

This product was short weight.

On April 25, 1940, the United States attorney for the District of New Jersey filed a libel against 70 cases of peanut butter at Newark, N. J., alleging that the article had been shipped in interstate commerce on or about February 12, 1940. by Producers Peanut Co., Inc., from Suffolk, Va.; and charging that it was misbranded. It was labeled in part: (Jars) "The Better Grade Uco Peanut Butter Contents 12 Ozs. Net Wt. Uco Food Corp. Distributors Newark, N. J."

The article was alleged to be misbranded in that the statement on the label, "Contents 12 Ozs. Net Wt.," was false and misleading since it was not correct; and in that it was in package form and failed to bear an accurate statement of the quantity of the contents.

On December 21, 1940, no claimant having appeared, judgment of condemnation was entered and it was ordered that the labels be destroyed and the product distributed to charitable institutions.

1352. Misbranding of peanut butter. Fault decree of condemnation. institution. (F. D. C. No. 2044. Sample No. 5868–E.)

This product was short weight.

On June 3, 1940, the United States attorney for the Southern District of West Virginia filed a libel against 50 cases of peanut butter at Williamson, W. Va., alleging that the article had been shipped in interstate commerce on or about April 2, 1940, by Producers Peanut Co., Inc., from Suffolk, Va., and charging that it was misbranded. It was labeled in part: (Jar) "Armour's Star Pure Peanut Butter 6 Oz. Net * * * Armour and Company."

Misbranding was alleged in substance in that the statement on the label, "6 Oz. Net." was false and misleading since the jars contained less than that

On June 14, 1940, no claimant having appeared, judgment of condemnation was entered and the product was ordered delivered to a charitable institution.

OILS AND FATS

OLIVE OIL

1353. Adulteration and misbranding of olive oil. U. S. v. 10 Cans and 24 Cans of Olive Oil. Default decrees of condemnation and destruction. (F. D. C. Nos. 3169, 3170. Sample Nos. 36626–E, 36627–E, 36628–E.)

This product, which was represented to be pure olive oil, was found to consist

almost entirely of cottonseed oil with little or no olive oil present.

On October 9, 1940, the United States attorney for the District of Massachusetts filed libels against 34 cans of olive oil at Framingham, Mass., alleging that the article had been shipped in interstate commerce on or about September 23 and October 7, 1940, by the Columbia Tea Co. from Providence, R. I.; and charging that it was adulterated and misbranded. The article was labeled in part: (Cans) "Puglia Brand Superfine Pure Olive Oil" and "Pure Stella Alpino Brand Imported Olive Oil."

The article was alleged to be adulterated in that a substance consisting almost entirely of cottonseed oil with little or no olive oil had been substituted

wholly or in part for olive oil, which it purported to be.

The Puglia brand was alleged to be misbranded in that the following statements in the labeling were false and misleading as applied to an article consisting almost entirely of cottonseed oil with little or no olive oil: "Superfine Pure Olive Oil Imported From Lucca, Italy"; "Imported from Italy." The Stella Alpino brand was alleged to be misbranded in that it was offered for sale under the